

**REMARKS****INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 13, 14, 20 and 21 have been amended, and new claims 22-27 have been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 8-17, and 19-27 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:**

**A.** In the Office Action, at pages 5-13, numbered paragraph 10, claims 1-6, 8-17 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373; hereafter, Ohyama) in view of Song (USPN 5,691,778; hereafter, Song). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 13, 14, and 20 have been amended to show more clearly that the apparatus of the present invention includes, and the method and system include, the additional function information stored in the memory unit is updated whenever the functions of the image processing apparatus are updated or a new function is added to the image processing apparatus. These amendments are supported by paragraph [0032] of the specification. Claims 2 and 14 are amended to include "wherein the remote control signal is one of a selection signal or position information, and wherein if the remote control signal is position information, the position information is input using directional keys located around a selection button and discloses a position of additional function information to be selected."

Such an arrangement is not taught or suggested by Ohyama and/or Song.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 13, and 20 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373) in view of Song (USPN 5,691,778). Since claims 2-6, 8-17, and 19 depend from amended claims 1 and 13, respectively, claims 2-6, 8-17, and 19 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373) in view of Song (USPN 5,691,778) for at least the reasons claims 1 and 13 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373) in view of Song (USPN 5,691,778).

**B.** In the Office Action, at pages 14-15, numbered paragraph 11, claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373; hereafter, Ohyama) in view of Chang et al. (US 2003/0090515; hereafter, Chang). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed

and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 21 has been amended in accordance with the amendment to claim 20. Neither Ohyama nor Chang teaches or suggests a memory unit storing code information corresponding to a remote control signal from the remote control and additional function information of the image processing apparatus determined based on a frequency of use of the image processing apparatus.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 21 of the present invention is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohyama et al. (USPN 5,751,373) in view of Chang et al. (US 2003/0090515).

**NEW CLAIMS:**

Claims 22-25 are added based on paragraph [0025] of the specification of the present invention. Claims 26-27 are added as dependent claims to claims 20 and 21, respectively, based on the amendment to claim 2.

New claim 22 recites that the features of the present invention include the apparatus of claim 1, wherein if a code corresponding to the remote control signal received by the remote control signal receiver is not stored in the memory unit, the controller ignores the remote control signal. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that this new claim distinguishes over the prior art.

New claim 23 recites that the features of the present invention include the method of claim 13, wherein if a code corresponding to the remote control signal received by the remote control signal receiver is not stored in the memory unit, the method further comprises ignoring the remote control signal. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that this new claim distinguishes over the prior art.

New claim 24 recites that the features of the present invention include the image processing system of claim 20, wherein if a code corresponding to the remote control signal received by the remote control signal receiver is not stored in the memory unit, the controller ignores the remote control signal. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that this new claim distinguishes over the prior art.

New claim 25 recites that the features of the present invention include The apparatus of claim 21, wherein if a code corresponding to the remote control signal from the remote control is not stored in the memory unit, the controller ignores the remote control signal. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that this new claim distinguishes over the prior art.

New claim 26 recites that the features of the present invention include the image processing system of claim 20, wherein the system further comprises an on-screen-display (OSD) processor, controlled by the controller, generating OSD data corresponding to the

additional function information, and outputting the OSD data to the display unit, wherein the remote control signal is one of a selection signal or position information, and wherein if the remote control signal is position information, the position information is input using directional keys located around a selection button and discloses a position of additional function information to be selected. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that this new claim distinguishes over the prior art.

New claim 27 recites that the features of the present invention include the apparatus of claim 21, the apparatus comprises an on-screen-display (OSD) processor, controlled by the controller, generating OSD data corresponding to the additional function information, and outputting the OSD data to the display unit, wherein the remote control signal is one of a selection signal or position information, and wherein if the remote control signal is position information, the position information is input using directional keys located around a selection button and discloses a position of additional function information to be selected. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that this new claim distinguishes over the prior art.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 29, 2007

By: Darleen J. Stockley  
Darleen J. Stockley  
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501